

Valentina Tymkova, Ph.D. (Philology),
*Associate Professor of the Foreign Philology and Translation Department,
Vinnytsya Institute of Trade and Economics,
State University of Trade and Economics*
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5170-5412>
Elvira Manzhos, Ph.D. (Pedagogy),
*Associate Professor of the Latin and Medical Terminology Department,
Mykola Pyrohov National Memorial Medical University*
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0287-3107>

GLOBALIZATION CHALLENGES: BORROWED LEXIS IN CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTIC DISCOURSE

This article examines the functioning of English borrowings (Anglicisms) and the mechanisms of their incorporation into the language of contemporary linguistic discourse, including the sphere of mass communication. Particular attention is paid to the increasing interest observed in recent decades in Ukrainian and English language contacts, which are driven by significant extralinguistic factors. It has been established that, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the majority of lexical borrowings in Ukrainian were Anglo-Americanisms. The spread of Anglicisms, the expansion of word-formation patterns involving English morphemes, the specifics of their usage, and even their influence on public consciousness underscore the need for a comprehensive study of borrowed lexis. Despite the considerable body of contemporary scholarship devoted to various aspects of lexical borrowing, the issues of the entry and assimilation of foreign vocabulary, and particularly Anglicisms, remain a subject of sustained scholarly interest.

New methodological approaches to the representation of Anglicisms within mass media discourse make it possible to identify additional principles and mechanisms underlying their assimilation in the language, while also enhancing communicative effectiveness. This, in turn, highlights the relevance and timeliness of the present study. The characteristic features of media language are identified, namely: the quantitative and qualitative expansion of communicative domains; the diversification of linguistic behavior across social groups, reflected in the linguistic reality of mass media; the democratization of the publicistic style and the increasing diffuseness of media language; the "Americanization" of media discourse; and the tendency to follow linguistic fashion.

The article analyzes the functioning of Anglicisms in the thematic domains of "Economy" and "Science and Technology", as these borrowings are actively penetrating all spheres of Ukrainian social life. The findings demonstrate that the study of Anglicisms enables the identification of semantic shifts in meaning, manifested through the narrowing or broadening of the semantics of English borrowings, as well as the factors determining the choice and use of particular units. Speakers of the recipient language tend to favor English borrowed lexis due to its stylistic and emotional expressive potential, as well as the phonetic, phonological, and lexical properties characteristic of Anglicisms.

Keywords: mass media language; borrowed lexis; Anglicisms; language ecology; language contact.

Ref. 23.

Валентина Тимкова, кандидат філологічних наук,
*доцент кафедри іноземної філології і перекладу
Вінницького торговельно-економічного інституту
Державного торговельно-економічного університету*
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5170-5412>
Ельвіра Манжос, кандидат педагогічних наук,
*доцент кафедри латинської мови та медичної термінології
Вінницького національного медичного університету імені М. І. Пирогова*
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0287-3107>

ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЙНІ ВИКЛИКИ: ЗАПОЗИЧЕНА ЛЕКСИКА В НОВІТНЬОМУ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

У публікації розглянуто функціонування та шляхи входження англійзмів у мову новітнього лінгвістичного дискурсу, зокрема і засобів масової комунікації. Особливу увагу зосереджено на тому, що протягом останніх десятиліть спостерігається зростання інтересу до українсько-англійських мовних контактів, що зумовлено вагомими позалінгвальними причинами. Встановлено, що в українській мові на початку XXI ст. із загальної кількості запозичень більшість становили саме англо-американізми. Зазначено, що поширення англійзмів, збільшення способів словотвору з урахуванням англійських морфем, аспекти вживання, і навіть вплив на суспільну свідомість викликають необхідність детального дослідження запозиченої лексики. З'ясовано, що незважаючи на безліч сучасних наукових праць,

присвячених різним аспектам запозичень, проблеми входження та освоєння інішомовної лексики, зокрема англїзмів, становлять значний науковий інтерес.

Проаналїзовано функціонування англїзмів тематичних груп "Економіка", "Наука і техніка", адже вони активно входять в усі сфери життя українського соціуму. Зроблено висновки про те, що дослідження англїзмів дозволяє виявити семантичні зрушення у значенні слова, що виражено у звуженні чи розширенні семантики запозичень з англїйської та чинники, що визначають вживання того чи іншого англїзму.

Ключові слова: мова засобів масової комунікації; запозичена лексика; англїзми; мовна екологі; мовні контакти.

Problem statement. Modern Ukrainian exhibits a significant number of new words and word combinations, the majority of which are Anglicisms. This process is largely spontaneous and uncontrolled, often leading to the uncritical imitation of foreign sounds, words, and expressions, the contamination of the native language, and, at times, to misunderstanding between the source of information and the ordinary language user.

The beginning of the twenty first century may be characterized as a period of intensive expansion of the English language. Today, English functions as the language of international organizations, conferences, scholarly publications, internet communication, online conferencing, international law, and many other domains. The spread of English in the fields of information technology and intercultural communication has resulted in the active influx of borrowed lexis. Language is closely connected with social life: it accumulates and preserves a people's cultural values, which are fixed in the vocabulary and realized in both written and spoken forms. Borrowed vocabulary not only introduces elements of another linguistic system into the recipient language, but also shapes modes of perception and models of world organization. Interest in Anglicisms as an object of study among linguists, cultural theorists, and other researchers is therefore explained by the fact that lexis forms a specific worldview and system of values for the recipient. In other words, the deliberate use of Anglicisms reflects developmental tendencies and characteristic features of social life.

The historical study of the vocabulary of modern Ukrainian literary language remains one of the important tasks of Ukrainian linguistics. The indeterminacy of lexical boundaries is conditioned by the continuous nature of language development, its constant dynamism and variability, and the ongoing replenishment of the lexicon with new words alongside the loss of obsolete ones. Vocabulary is the domain of language in which social change is reflected most rapidly, since shifts in socio-economic and cultural life inevitably necessitate the continual enrichment of the lexicon with new units.

As is well known, the enrichment of vocabulary may derive not only from the internal resources of the native language, but also from borrowings from other languages. Linguistic and extralinguistic factors underlying the emergence of foreign lexical units have long remained at the center of scholarly attention.

In this connection, studies devoted to the formation of the lexical system of Ukrainian through Anglicisms,

to the attitudes of speakers of the recipient language toward foreign vocabulary, and to the analysis of the semantic structure of Anglicisms in comparison with their Ukrainian equivalents, appear particularly relevant. The active penetration of Anglicisms into the Ukrainian lexicon is explained by the fact that many developments in art, technology, economics, politics, and service industries originate in English-speaking countries. Moreover, English today is regarded as a universal means of communication.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the features of the functioning and adaptation of Anglicisms in the language of Ukrainian mass media and in the Ukrainian lexicon more broadly.

Introduction. The question of why one language borrows elements from another has long attracted the attention of linguists. This issue has been examined in the works of both foreign and Ukrainian scholars, including L. Krysin, S. Bulych, N. Shestakova, Yu. Sorokin, S. Semchynskyi, A. Martinet, R. Pavlova, O. Morokhovskiy, O. Muromtseva, B. Abbasova, A. Marti, V. Akulenko, H. Paul, and E. Richter. A considerable number of contemporary researchers have likewise addressed this problem, among them V. Simonok, O. Styshov, P. Selihei, V. Akulenko, V. Pecherska, N. Bosak, M. Bondar, I. Kochan, D. Mazuryk, S. Fedorets, L. Struhanets, A. Lomovtseva, B. Azhniuk, and L. Arkhypenko.

English words and word combinations attract readers' attention, and their functioning in a text serves specific communicative purposes. The emergence of Anglicisms in modern Ukrainian reflects active dynamic processes taking place within the contemporary Ukrainian lexicon.

The problem of enriching a language through numerous foreign lexical items has been explored in many studies both in Ukraine and abroad. Based on Ukrainian-language material, borrowed units of the first half of the twentieth century were examined by V. Samiylenko, R. Smal-Stotskyi, D. Sheludko, and others. In the second half of the twentieth century, many specialists focused on the semantic and grammatical processes accompanying the incorporation of foreign lexical items into the lexicon of the recipient language, including V. Akulenko, D. Budniak, M. Vakulenko, Ya. Holdovanskyi, A. Hudmanian, Yu. Zhluktenko, R. Zorivchak, A. Ivanytska, I. Katypin, M. Kocherhan, O. Medvid, O. Muromtseva, O. Ponomariv, S. Ryzhykova, V. Rusanivskyi, S. Semchynskyi, Yu. Tsymbaliuk, and others.

The vocabulary of any modern language has developed over a long historical period; therefore, lexical units originating from different historical stages and linguistic sources, both old and newly formed, native and borrowed. They have inevitably influenced the quality and structure of the lexicon [22, 156]. Borrowing is one of the key factors in the development of a language. Depending on the source language, such units are referred to as Anglicisms (or Anglicisms), Romanisms, Bohemisms, Latinisms, Polonisms, and so forth. We consider it appropriate to use the lexeme *Anglicism*, which contains the affixoid *-ism* (as seen in the examples above). Contemporary linguists such as B. Azhniuk, Ya. Bytkivska, and A. Lomovtseva also employ this term in their research. Sharing their position, we define *Anglicism* as a lexical unit borrowed from English or through the mediation of English, which possesses at least one sememe formed under the dominant influence of the English language. Borrowings expand the lexical resources of a language, provide new roots, word-formation elements, and precise terms, and reflect the realities of human life.

Yu. Zhluktenko identified two meanings of the term *borrowing*: the very process of using elements of the source language within the system of the recipient language; the result of this process (that is, the heterogeneous elements introduced from the source-language system into the recipient-language system) [7, 60].

The notions of *adaptation* and *integration* represent concepts that reflect the complex nature of the absorption of foreign lexical elements and their heterogeneous behavior within a new linguistic space (Ya. Bytkivska, A. Hudmanian, H. Kazarian).

Prominent public figures, writers, and scholars have expressed differing attitudes toward foreign borrowings. Some of them (D. Barannyk, Ya. Bytkivska, I. Losev, P. Selihei, O. Styshov, among others) view borrowing as a natural process of lexical enrichment, whereas others from earlier periods (I. Nechui-Levytsky, M. Levchenko, A. Krymsky, B. Hrinchenko, M. Sumtsov, I. Ohienko) to present-day linguistics (V. Hvozdev, I. Farion, and others) hold an opposing view. Advocating linguistic purity, they largely regard foreign lexical items as a stream of words that threatens the stability and originality of modern Ukrainian. The Ukrainian scholar A. Krymsky wrote that “*there is no reason to argue about where words come from*”, and considered attempts to eliminate foreign lexical units already firmly integrated into the Ukrainian literary language unnecessary, since “*no one will obey any philological prohibition in this respect*” [8].

According to I. Nechui-Levytsky, foreign elements have the right to enter Ukrainian-language usage only when no native word exists to designate a given concept or reality in the recipient language. Agreeing with this view, we consider justified those borrowings whose material is formed by “higher, scientific”

lexemes absent in the native language, while opposing the adoption of words that already have equivalents in Ukrainian, as well as the displacement of indigenous lexical units as a result [14, 318].

The contemporary researcher P. Selihei likewise argues that, when coining a term for a new concept, there is generally no reason to give preference to foreign roots. A non-Slavic term may be appropriate when it denotes a phenomenon or concept first discovered and described abroad. However, if a concept originates within Ukrainian scholarship, it is more natural to name it using Ukrainian (or broader Slavic) root material, since this lexical resource is in no way inferior to Latin or English [15, 6].

Thus, borrowing is possible, first, in a monolingual context if there exists a social community proficient in two languages, and second, in a bilingual context. Ukrainian linguist Yu. Zhluktenko observed: “While monolinguals satisfy [the need for continuous lexical innovation] primarily through the internal resources of their own language, bilinguals constantly have their second language at hand as a source of linguistic material” [7, 108]. In the twenty-first century, however, “journalistic practice maintains the tradition of frequent borrowings, since these constitute the core of the socio-political lexicon, and newspapers (mostly the language of mass media) strive for constant renewal of expressive means” [11, 41].

We argue that this situation may lead to the oversaturation of media language with unnecessary or opaque lexical items, which in turn could obscure the essence of the text. As a result, readers, viewers, and listeners may lose interest in the media due to the lack of substantive content. P. Selihei notes: “There is no cause for concern: borrowings do not deprive our terminology of its distinctiveness, since they are regulated by the norms of the Ukrainian language, adapt quickly to its word-formation and morphological system, and do not compromise its stability” [15, 16]. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that not all borrowed lexical items conform fully to the norms of the recipient language. At present, we observe a significant number of frequently used Anglicisms in the media that exist in two spelling variants.

At the same time, I. Farion warns: “Despite everything, the penetration of foreign elements into the structure of any language is never entirely unimpeded, yet regarding Anglo-American neologisms, we show complete openness, borrowing entire lexical sets, sometimes even Latin ones” [20, 150]. Such linguistic phenomena are largely driven by the fashion for foreign-origin words, employed to attract consumer attention.

I. Losev observed: “Borrowings do not cause harm, not only from related cultures but even from entirely foreign ones. However, exceeding the limit of beneficial borrowing leads to the dissolution of one culture

within another, to assimilation, and to the complete loss of the spiritual sovereignty of a culture” [11, 23]. P. Selihei also emphasizes: “We must accept reality: Americanization is an objective, and therefore inevitable, process. The English-speaking world leads other countries in cultural and economic development, and countless inventions and discoveries are published in English, with three-quarters of scientific research disseminated in the language. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the vast majority of new terms originate in English and subsequently spread worldwide, including into Ukrainian” [15, 16].

The causes of lexical borrowing may vary. Let us consider the principal classifications of linguistic and extralinguistic factors underlying borrowings, through which the lexical stock of contemporary Standard Ukrainian is enriched. L. Arkhyenko [2] divides the main causes of borrowing into two groups. The first group is linguistic factors, which include: the absence of a word to denote a new object, phenomenon, or concept; the need for a specific lexical item to eliminate misunderstanding between interlocutors; the necessity to differentiate semantically related but nonetheless distinct concepts; the tendency to replace phrases and descriptive constructions with single word designations; the need for conceptual specialization in particular spheres; the need to name a communicatively salient concept, when a concept concerns vital human interests, the word that denotes it becomes widely used; the tendency to consolidate borrowings that may be grouped into a certain lexical series on the basis of shared meaning and the recurrence of a structural element; and the need for new nominations as a tribute to fashion, prestige, or the desire to enhance one’s authority in the eyes of others. The second group is extralinguistic factors: economic; sociopolitical; cultural and everyday-cultural; scientific; and socio-psychological [2, 5–6]. As we see, the author employs two terms to denote linguistic and non-linguistic determinants namely, *linguistic* and *extralinguistic causes of borrowing*.

P. Selihei, in turn, proposes focusing only on the key factors influencing the penetration of borrowed words, grouping them as follows: (1) foreign terminology is international and conventional among foreign specialists; Ukraine views itself as part of Europe, is catching up with developed countries in the spheres of economy and culture, adopts the scientific and technological achievements of Western nations, and has access to modern information technologies; (2) the tendency toward conciseness and single-word nomination: speakers prefer to express a concept by means of one borrowed term rather than through a lengthy indigenous expression, concentrating the necessary meaning in a single word, from which further single-word derivatives can also be formed; (3) the foreign word is monosemous, its semantics are more

concrete and clearly delineated, it specifies an existing concept and introduces a new semantic nuance that is difficult or impossible to convey by a native equivalent; (4) aesthetic or ethical considerations; (5) foreign words also spread rapidly when certain social groups become fascinated with the culture of another nation [15, 10–11].

N. Bosak and V. Pecherska [4] distinguish between linguistic (intralinguistic) and non-linguistic (external or extralinguistic) causes of borrowing from one language into another. They argue that linguistic causes are objective in nature; however, they do not occur spontaneously, since they are always determined by such factors as: the intralingual need to name a new object or concept and the absence of a corresponding notion in the cognitive base of the recipient language; the need to differentiate internally related yet nonetheless distinct concepts for the purpose of clarification, which is associated with the polysemy of Ukrainian words; the tendency toward linguistic economy. That is, the replacement of multi word expressions with a single word and a shift in the speaker and listener antinomy in favor of the speaker; the lack of lexemes free of connotative meanings; the striving for novelty and freshness, emotionality and expressiveness against the background of standardized usage; the intention to express a positive or negative connotation that is absent in equivalent units of the recipient language; and the need to specify and further detail a concept.

Non-linguistic causes, in turn, include such factors as: the development of economic and cultural relations between Ukraine and other countries; the influence of stereotypical perceptions of other countries and their lifestyles among ordinary citizens; the use of foreign-origin words by speakers to demonstrate education or distinctiveness, and the perception by recipients of such words as more scholarly, prestigious, or better sounding; the fact that a foreign word becomes more prestigious than its Ukrainian counterpart, its expressive novelty proving attractive and signaling a high level of awareness on the part of the speaker; the prestige of foreign languages and the growing number of Ukrainians who know them; and the use of a foreign word with the aim of “modernizing” the text [4, 43–45].

V. Simonok maintains that the process of borrowing involves an interaction between external and internal linguistic factors. Accordingly, the scholar distinguishes two types of causes of borrowing: extralinguistic (external) and intralinguistic (internal). The external causes include political, economic, and cultural relations between nations, whereas the internal causes encompass the need to clarify or specify certain concepts and to refine or elaborate the meanings of existing words [17, 12]. The emergence of borrowings in contemporary Standard Ukrainian may also be conditioned

by the development of the semantic system of the recipient language: "Words were not only refined but also partially disappeared for various reasons. When the concepts they denoted remain in the conceptual picture of the world, they are replaced by new words taken from the same or other languages. Such borrowings compensate for the lost words" [17, 18]. Among the principal factors contributing to the spread of foreign lexical items in modern Ukrainian, the press should also be highlighted, since it is one of the main channels through which vocabulary is transferred from one language into another.

D. Mazuryk, in turn, also proposes distinguishing between external and internal factors in the expansion of the lexical stock. However, in Mazuryk's view, the primary causes are internal namely, the need to designate a new concept and the desire to assign a new (clearer or more concise) name to a reality of the external world that already has a designation [12, 5].

Of interest is the classification proposed by S. Fedorets, who examines linguistic and extralinguistic causes of borrowing foreign words [21, 4].

According to A. Lomovtsev, two groups of factors play an important role in enriching the lexical stock of contemporary Standard Ukrainian: sociopsychological causes and the frequency of foreign words [9, 100].

O. Styshov identifies the following extralinguistic factors that influence the expansion of the lexicon of modern Ukrainian: the democratization of social life; a substantial weakening of censorship; the status of Ukrainian as an official language; changes in the social structure of Ukrainian society; the practical needs of speakers (self-expression in language); the fashion for certain words; and the search for new expressive means [19, 21–22].

The intensive penetration of Anglicisms into national language systems is an international phenomenon primarily driven by globalization. Globalization presupposes informational openness and, consequently, the informational presence of foreign participants in the communicative process. A visible manifestation of this presence in Ukrainian mass media in recent years has been foreign-language inclusions. That is, units that retain English orthography rather than being transcribed in Ukrainian. Most frequently, these appear as abbreviations or as logos of international corporations. The presence of such units may be qualified as a manifestation of marginal bilingualism; in this case, we are dealing not with borrowing in its classical form, but rather with code-switching is sporadic shifts from Ukrainian to English [1, 191].

There is yet another specific factor in Ukrainian that stimulates the influx of Anglicisms, the use of English-derived lexical units as an alternative to russianisms. Owing to intensified international cultural contacts, the development of tourism, and the internationalization of the media space, the need has increased for naming

foreign cultural realities that lack full analogues in Ukrainian life or that possess a distinctly pronounced national specificity [1, 198].

M. Bondar proposes to divide the principal factors of borrowing into extralinguistic and intralinguistic ones. The author emphasizes that the extralinguistic factors determining the verbal features of modern texts are directly related to the personality of the author (education, character traits, experience of living abroad, the desire to demonstrate erudition and awareness, the aspiration to appear unconventional, a tendency toward affectation, etc.) [3, 8].

On the basis of the factors analyzed above, we propose our own classificatory framework of linguistic and extralinguistic causes of borrowing in contemporary Standard Ukrainian. Extralinguistic factors include: the development of socio-economic relations; political contacts between states, which intensify significantly under conditions of globalization; the influence of other countries' lifestyles; the fashion for foreign words; speakers' aesthetic and ethical attitudes; the achievements of foreign countries in specific spheres of public and social activity; the transmission of cultural values; multilingualism; the conditions in which modern Ukrainian functions; shifts of a communicative-pragmatic nature; the prestige of Romance and Germanic languages; stereotypical perceptions of Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Italy, Spain, France, and others among ordinary citizens; and the use of foreign-origin words as a means of demonstrating education or distinctiveness.

As we can see, in recent year borrowings have entered the language from various spheres of human activity, and this has been conditioned by changes in sociopolitical circumstances and by the emergence of new realities for which Ukrainian either lacked adequate designations or for which existing designations, for various reasons, no longer satisfied speakers [21].

Thus, changes in the sociopolitical, governmental, and economic structure of Ukraine, the transformation of dominant forms of ownership, and scientific and technological progress. All these ongoing processes, regardless of their positive or negative significance for Ukrainian society, continue to stimulate the borrowing of new lexical items [2, 11].

The current state of Ukrainian at the beginning of the twenty-first century is characterized by extremely active borrowing processes involving large layers of vocabulary from different domains of social life. Entire lexical series that are typologically uniform are also being borrowed (for example, from English: hamburger, cheeseburger, kok-burger; yogurt, frugurt, apigurt, emigurt; clip-maker, image-maker, news-maker, hit-maker, play-maker) [18]. This leads to a transition from quantity to quality: within such lexical clusters, structural elements begin to be distinguished, and the

meanings of their segmented components become increasingly regularized.

Anglicisms are actively penetrating the socio-economic sphere. In particular, the thematic group of borrowings labeled “Economics” contains numerous lexical items that have been transferred from English. Many of them have already entered active usage and are frequently employed by ordinary speakers without requiring explanation, for example: Ukr. дилер – Eng. *dealer* (Ukrainian equivalent: *посередник* ‘intermediary’); Ukr. маркетинг – Eng. *marketing* (Ukrainian equivalent: *торгівля* ‘trade’); Ukr. тендер – Eng. *tender* (Ukrainian equivalent: *конкурс* ‘competition’); Ukr. інвестор – Eng. *investor* (Ukrainian equivalent: *покровитель* ‘patron’); Ukr. дефолт – Eng. *default* (Ukrainian equivalent: *невплата* ‘non-payment’); Ukr. трейдер – Eng. *trader* (Ukrainian equivalent: *торговець* ‘merchant’); Ukr. брокер – Eng. *broker* (Ukrainian equivalent: *посередник* ‘intermediary’); Ukr. дисконт – Eng. *discount* (Ukrainian equivalent: *знижка* ‘reduction, discount’); Ukr. менеджер – Eng. *manager* (Ukrainian equivalents: *розпорядник, заступник, адміністратор, управитель* ‘administrator, supervisor, manager’) [18], etc.

However, a significant number of borrowed lexemes are new and denote new phenomena, objects, and concepts in the socio-economic sphere, and therefore are often incomprehensible to people whose professions are not related to finance, economics, or business. Nevertheless, the mass media widely use such economic and financial lexemes of a terminological nature as: Ukr. мерчендайзер – Eng. *merchandiser* (instead of the Ukrainian – *торговець* ‘seller’), Ukr. хедхантинг – Eng. *headhunting* (instead of the Ukrainian – *переманювання спеціаліста* ‘recruitment poaching’), Ukr. інвойс – Eng. *invoice* (instead of the Ukrainian – *рахунок* ‘bill’), Ukr. ф’ючерс – Eng. *futures* (instead of the Ukrainian – *біржовий терміновий контракт* ‘exchange forward contract’), Ukr. франчайзинг – Eng. *franchising* (instead of the Ukrainian – *пільга* ‘privilege’), Ukr. аутсорсинг – Eng. *outsourcing* (instead of the Ukrainian – *субпідряд* ‘subcontracting’), Ukr. фандрейзинг – Eng. *fundraising* (instead of the Ukrainian – *збір коштів* ‘collection of funds’), etc., which require additional explanation [18].

Among new borrowed words, many are incomprehensible to ordinary speakers, as they belong to the professional vocabulary of IT specialists [5]. Consequently, the language of mass media frequently employs Anglicisms that also lack Ukrainian equivalents, for example: Ukr. адаптер – Eng. *adapter*, Ukr. плоттер – Eng. *plotter*, Ukr. каттер – Eng. *cutter*, Ukr. лептоп – Eng. *laptop*, Ukr. софтвер – Eng. *software*, Ukr. десктоп – Eng. *desktop*, Ukr. чипсет – Eng. *chipset*.

The adaptation of Anglicisms related to scientific and technological development reflects a tolerant atti-

tude of one linguistic community toward other linguistic cultures and civilizations. We argue that the indicator of “linguistic tolerance” plays a crucial role in the contemporary global intercultural space. Anglicisms are typically used in everyday speech by young people who possess some knowledge of English. However, even this demographic does not always fully understand the borrowed terms. As contemporary sociological studies note, in discussing current societal trends, a 25-year-old English-speaking individual may assert that *downshifting* refers to a modern lifestyle trend involving retreat into nature or the countryside and a rejection of contemporary material benefits. In Ukrainian mass media, the lexeme *downshifting* is most often used to describe the relocation of people from cities to villages. In reality, however, *downshifting* refers to mitigating the negative effects of active professional life on personal well-being, simplifying one’s lifestyle, and renouncing material goods. Older generations generally do not understand such borrowings, except perhaps those for whom English is a professional requirement [16, 18].

At present, English-language expansion is a concern for all those committed to the preservation of their native tongue. The Anglicization of nearly all the world’s languages threatens natural linguistic diversity, which scholars consider “a significant and harmful ecological disaster of our time” [4, 470]. Moreover, the English language has become a marker of prestige, and its use in one’s own speech is socially valued.

Possession of an international lexical repertoire demonstrates a speaker’s adaptation to contemporary society. At the same time, scholars note the excessive use of Anglo-Americanisms and the preference for foreign words over Ukrainian equivalents [1].

Recently, new borrowings have emerged in the Ukrainian language, such as *insider* (a person with access to non-public, valuable information), *messenger* (an instant messaging application), *renovation* (renewal), *hosting* (a service for website placement on the Internet), and *rebranding* (an active marketing strategy) [6].

Possession of an international lexical repertoire by contemporary Ukrainians reflects their adaptation to the modern globalized world. In this context, foreign influence under conditions of globalization undoubtedly plays a positive role in enriching the Ukrainian language with new vocabulary. At the same time, scholars note the excessive use of Americanisms by modern Ukrainians, with a preference for foreign words over their Ukrainian equivalents. Similar phenomena occurred historically; for example, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, French and German were prevalent among the aristocracy. Contemporary journalists, politicians, and cultural figures continue to follow this tradition, regularly employing foreign words and expressions such as *billboard* (Eng. *billboard* –

advertising sign), *bitcoin* (Eng. *bitcoin* – a payment system and its unit of account), *cashback* (Eng. *cash back* – money returned to a buyer), *coworking* (Eng. *coworking* – shared workspace), *coaching* (Eng. *coaching* – instruction, training), *lifehack* (Eng. *life hacking* – useful tip), *mainstream* (Eng. *mainstream* – dominant trend in a field at a given time), *message* (Eng. *message* – communication), and *trend* (Eng. *trend* – tendency) [18, 137].

According to V. Kolesov, the language is experiencing a process of “barbarization,” which he defines as “the saturation of the language with barbarisms and foreign words that do not enrich it but merely duplicate words already existing in the language. This phenomenon threatens to deprive us of one of the most important tools of intellectual and creative activity: the literary language of the nation” [9, 81]. Among the factors influencing the intensity of English borrowings in the language of mass media are the expansion of intercultural contacts, increased information exchange, and the need to regulate new types of human activity. The use of English vocabulary in everyday communication has become not only habitual but also prestigious. Native Ukrainian speakers, often unconsciously, contribute to the increasing role of English while undervaluing their own language. This trend poses a direct threat to national culture and the Ukrainian language. Scholars recognize the negative impact of foreign vocabulary as it penetrates everyday Ukrainian communication.

Conclusions. Not all spheres of human activity are equally receptive to borrowings from the English language. This primarily depends on the specifics of communication within a particular social environment and its participants. Consequently, certain areas of language use are more or less susceptible to the influence of foreign vocabulary.

The functioning of Anglicisms in mass-media discourse is determined by the conditions of communication, the goals and intentions of the sender and receiver, and their background knowledge. The intensity of the adoption and adaptation of English borrowings is influenced by a combination of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, as well as by the role of English in intercultural communication. These factors are decisive in determining how quickly a foreign word is assimilated, what function it performs in the lives of native speakers, in which domains it becomes entrenched, and why speakers may prefer foreign vocabulary even when synonymous Ukrainian words exist.

Analysis of empirical material shows that Anglicisms used in the media are not always fully integrated into the lexical-semantic system of Ukrainian. In many cases, this is due to factors such as the retention of the original orthography, the transition of foreign vocabulary into jargon, the presence of synonymous words in Ukrainian, irregular usage of a lexical item, and the prestige associated with using Anglicisms, which high-

lights the speaker’s level of knowledge and draws attention to them.

On the one hand, the numerous Anglicisms and Americanisms incorporated into Ukrainian reflect natural processes of integration and the intensification of economic, political, cultural, and social ties between Ukraine and other countries. On the other hand, however, in the pursuit of everything foreign and the desire to imitate Western models, there is a risk of losing national distinctiveness, including linguistic identity. Language reflects a way of life and a worldview, and this can sometimes result in reduced interest in one’s native language and culture.

Language is living and dynamic, and linguistic changes are natural. Nevertheless, wherever Ukrainian equivalents exist, it is advisable to avoid unnecessary foreign elements and not to follow trends blindly. Language ecology should form the basis of state language policy, particularly in education and mass media. Language is what unites Ukrainian society today. Our cohesion depends on a shared language, but only if it lives, develops, and enriches itself in accordance with linguo-ecological principles, which remain a subject for further scholarly research.

REFERENCES

1. Azhniuk, B.M. (2008). Anhlizmy v suchasni ukrainiskii, rosiiskii i cheski movakh. [Anglicisms in modern Ukrainian, Russian and Czech languages]. *Movoznavstvo*. No. 2–3, pp. 190–207. [in Ukrainian].
2. Arkhypenko, L.M. (2005). Inshomovni leksychni zapozychennia v ukrainiskii movi: etapy i stupeni adaptatsii (na materialii anhlitsyzmiv u presi kintsia XX – pochatku XXI st.) [Foreign lexical borrowings in the Ukrainian language: stages and degrees of adaptation]. *Ukrainian Language*. Kharkiv, 314 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bondar, M.V. (2004). Aktyvni leksyko-semantychni protsesy v movi khudozhnoi prozy kintsia XX – pochatku XXI st. [Active lexical-semantic processes in the language of literary prose of the late 20th – early 21st centuries]. *Extended abstract of candidate’s thesis*. Kyiv, 19 p. [in Ukrainian].
4. Bosak, N.F. & Pecherska, V.A. (2005). Prychyny poiavy zapozychen-anhlitsyzmiv v ukrainskykh ZMI. Leksyko-hramatychni innovatsii v suchasnykh slovianskykh movakh [Reasons for the emergence of borrowings-anglicisms in the Ukrainian media. Lexico-grammatical innovations in modern Slavic languages]. *Materialy II Mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferentsii, Dnipropetrovsk, 14–15 kvitnia 2005 r.* – Proceedings of the II International Conference, Dnipropetrovsk, April 14–15, 2005 (Ed.). T.S. Prystaiko. Dnipropetrovsk, pp. 43–45. [in Ukrainian].
5. Vakulenko, M.O. (2015). Ukrainaska terminolohiia: kompleksnyi linhvistychnyi analiz: monohrafiia. [Ukrainian terminology: a comprehensive linguistic analysis]. Ivano-Frankivsk: Foliant, 361 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Vilnyi tlumachnyi slovnyk Ukrainskoi movy [Free explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/> [in Ukrainian].
7. Zhluktenko, Yu.A. (1996). Yazykovi kontakty [Language contacts]. *Problems of interlinguistics*. Kyiv, 135 p. [in Ukrainian].

8. Kunch, Z. & Kharchuk, L. (2016). Polisemiia v ukrainskii elektroenerhetychnii terminolohii. [Polysemy in Ukrainian electrical energy terminology]. *Bulletin of the National University "Lviv Polytechnic", series "Problems of Ukrainian Terminology"*. No. 842, pp. 77–85. [in Ukrainian].
9. Lomovtseva, A. (2003). Novitni anhlytsyzy v ukrainskii movi i problema leksychnoi variantnosti. [The latest Anglicisms in the Ukrainian language and the problem of lexical variation]. *Ukrainian Language*. No. 1, pp. 96–102. [in Ukrainian].
10. Lenets, K. V. (1988). Leksychni zminy ta yikh vidobrazhennia v movi suchasnoi presy. [Lexical changes and their reflection in the language of the modern press]. *Movoznavstvo*. No. 6, pp. 41–46. [in Ukrainian].
11. Losiev, I.V. (1995). Istorii i teoriia svitovoi kultury. Yevropeiskyi kontekst [History and Theory of World Culture. European Context]. *Study guide for students of higher educational institutions*. Kyiv, 224 p. [in Ukrainian].
12. Mazuryk, D.V. (2002). Innovatsiini protsesy v leksytsii suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy (90-ti roky XX st.) [Innovative processes in the vocabulary of the modern Ukrainian literary language (1990s)]. Extended abstract of candidate's thesis. Lviv, 21 p. [in Ukrainian].
13. Nechui-Levytskyi, I. (1912). Kryve dzerkalo ukrainskoi movy. Novi povisti y opovidannia. [The Crooked Mirror of the Ukrainian Language. New Stories and Tales]. Kyiv, Vol. 8. pp. 317–412. [in Ukrainian].
14. Radu, A. (2013). Movna ekolohiia: napriamy ta problemy doslidzhennia. [Language ecology: research directions and problems]. *Humanities Education in Technical Higher Educational Institutions*. No. 27, Kyiv, pp. 191–197. [in Ukrainian].
15. Semchynskyi, S.V. (1974). Semantychna interferentsiia mov [Semantic language interference]. Kyiv, 253 p. [in Ukrainian].
16. Serbenska, O. (2002). Suchasna ukrainska terminohrafiia i problemy ekolohii movy [Modern Ukrainian terminology and problems of language ecology]. *Bulletin of the National University "Lviv Polytechnic", series "Problems of Ukrainian Terminology"*. No. 453. pp. 17–20. [in Ukrainian].
17. Slovnyk inshomovnykh sliv (2000). [Dictionary of foreign words]. (Ed.). S.M. Morozova, L.M. Shkaraputy. Kyiv, 656 p. [in Ukrainian].
18. Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy: v 20-t (2010). [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language in 20 Volumes]. Kyiv, Vol 3. 911 p. [in Ukrainian].
19. Styshov, O.A. (2003). Ukrainska leksyka kintsia KhKh st. (na materialii movy zasobiv masovoi informatsii). [Ukrainian vocabulary of the late 20th century (based on the language of the mass media)]. Kyiv, 388 p. [in Ukrainian].
20. Farion, I. (2000). Anhlo-movnyi nastup v ukrainskii diisnosti [The Anglophone Offensive in Ukrainian Reality]. *Suchasnist*. No. 3. pp. 150–157. [in Ukrainian].
21. Fedorets, S.A. (2005). Anhliiski zapozychennia v movi suchasnoi ukrainskoi reklamy [English borrowings in the language of modern Ukrainian advertising]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Kharkiv, 18 p. [in Ukrainian].
22. Sherekh, Yu. (1951). Narys suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy [An outline of the modern Ukrainian literary language]. Miunkhen, 402 p. [in Ukrainian].
23. Tymkova, V. & Manzhos, E. (2025). Traditional stereotypes of speech etiquette in the framework of the Ukrainian outlook. *Youth & market*, No. 1 (233), pp. 156–162 [in English].

Стаття надійшла до редакції: 13.01.2026
Прийнято до друку: 24.02.2026
Опубліковано: 23.03.2026



“Навчання починається з діяльності”.

Йоганн Генріх Песталоцці
швейцарський педагог

“Навчати – це ще не означає виховувати; виховання можливе лише тоді, коли дитина сама стає співучасником навчання”.

Адольф Дістервег
німецький педагог-демократ

“Справжня любов до дітей – це вимогливість до них”.

Василь Сухомлинський
український педагог

“Розширювати свої знання можна тільки тоді, коли дивишся прямо в очі власному незнанню”.

Костянтин Ушинський
український педагог

